arXiv:1211.3918v1 [math.RT] 16 Nov 2012

PL UCKER RELATIONS AND SPHERICAL VARIETIES: APPLICATION TO MODEL VARIETIES

ROCCO CHIRIVÌ AND ANDREA MAFFEI

Abstract. A general framework for the reduction of the equations defining classes of spherical varieties to (maybe infinite dimensional) grassmannians is proposed. This is applied to model varieties of type A, B and C; in particular a standard monomial theory for these varieties is presented.

1. Introduction

A standard monomial theory for an algebra A over a field $\Bbbk$ is given by a set of generators $\mathbb{A}$, together with a notion of standardness for monomials in $\mathbb{A}$ such that A is spanned by standard monomials as a $\Bbbk$–vector space; further the relations in A writing non standard monomials in terms of standard ones, called straightening relations, are "upper triangular" (see Section 3 for details). One of the main purpose of standard monomial theory is to replace the knoweldge of the equations defining a variety by the order requirement in the straightening relations. Indeed in many situation this weaker property is enough to prove geometric results like normality, Cohen-Maculay property, degeneration results and others. Moreover the order structure of the straightening relations allows to prove that they are generators for the ideal defining the algebra A as a quotient of the symmetric algebra $\mathsf{S}(\mathbb{A})$. The first example of such a theory dates back to Hodge study in [9] of the grassmannian of k–spaces in a n–dimensional vector space.

A standard monomial theory for flag and Schubert varieties has been developed over the years by Lakshmibai, Musili and Seshadri [12], this program culminated in the work of Littelmann [13] (see also [3]) where such a theory is defined in the generality of symmetrizable Kac–Moody groups.

At the same time, in [5] a standard monomial theory for the coordinate ring of SL_n was reduced to that of the grassmannian of n–spaces in a $2n$–dimensional space. Next this result was generalized in various directions by many authors (see the introduction in [4] for further details). In our paper [4], we shown how a standard monomial theory for certain classes of symmetric varieties may be described in terms of the Plücker relations of a suitable, maybe infinite dimensional, grassmannians. Moreover all previous known cases of this type of reduction are particular instances of our construction for symmetric varieties.

The first purpose of the present paper is the development of a general framework for this reduction from the coordinate ring of a variety to the coordinate ring of a grassmannian. We propose how a suitable grassmannian for such process may be defined if we start with a spherical variety. However this proposal does not work in general for all spherical varieties, indeed various technical hypothesis must be met. It is however quite general and the hypothesis are fulfilled in many interesting cases. Let us explains our approach in more details.

Let G be a semisimple and connected algebraic group and let H be an algebraic subgroup such that $X \doteq G/H$ is spherical. Let Λ be the weight lattice and Λ^+ the monoid of dominant weights with respect to a fixed maximal torus and Borel subgroup of G. Denote by Ω^+ the monoid of spherical weights, i.e. of dominant weights λ such that the H–invariant subspace V_λ^H of the G–irreducible module V_λ is non–zero. Our first hypothesis is that Ω^+ is a free monoid; let $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \ldots, \varepsilon_\ell$ be its generators. Then the

---

2010 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 14M27; Secondary 22E46.

Key words and phrases. Spherical variety, model variety, standard monomial theory.

coordinate ring A of X is generated by $V^*_{\varepsilon_1}, V^*_{\varepsilon_2}, \ldots, V^*_{\varepsilon_\ell}$. Our aim is to construct a standard monomial theory having as generators a basis of $V^*_{\varepsilon_1} \oplus V^*_{\varepsilon_2} \oplus \cdots \oplus V^*_{\varepsilon_\ell}$.

The main request is the existence of a Kac–Moody group K such that G is the semisimple part of a Levi of K with the following properties. There exists a suitable grassmannian $\mathcal{F}$ for K, a G–invariant Richardson variety $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{F}$ and a line bundle $\mathcal{L}$ on $\mathcal{F}$ such that X may be embedded in a completion of $\mathcal{F}$, $H^0(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{L}) \simeq V^*_{\varepsilon_1} \oplus V^*_{\varepsilon_2} \oplus \cdots \oplus V^*_{\varepsilon_\ell}$ and $\oplus_{n \geqslant 0} H^0(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{L}^n)$ is isomorphic to the coordinate ring of G/H as G–modules. In a way, this group K is a bigger group of "hidden" symmetries for X.

Further we require the existence of an additive map $\mathsf{gr} : \Omega^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the following compatibility with tensor product of spherical modules holds: for all $\mu, \lambda, \nu \in \Omega^+$ such that $V^*_\nu \subset V^*_\lambda \otimes V^*_\mu$ we have $\mathsf{gr}(\nu) \leqslant \mathsf{gr}(\lambda + \mu)$. We require also that the generators $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, \ldots, \varepsilon_\ell$ are linearly ordered by gr. Finally a certain compatibility between the function gr and the multiplication of sections in $H^0(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L})$ is required.

Once all such hypothesis are fulfilled we are able to prove that the relations among a basis of $V^*_{\varepsilon_1} \oplus V^*_{\varepsilon_2} \oplus \cdots \oplus V^*_{\varepsilon_\ell}$ may be described in terms of the Plücker relations of $\mathcal{F}$, and for this reason we call the above general framework *plückerization* for X. Further a standard monomial theory for X may be described in terms of the standard monomial theory of $\mathcal{R}$, see Theorem 6. Using this we see that X degenerates to $\mathcal{R}$ in a G–equivariant flat way, see Corollary 7.

The construction of K, $\mathcal{F}$, $\mathcal{R}$, gr,... follows an empirical recipe. The main ingredients for this construction are suggested by the moltiplication rule of the modules $V^*_{\varepsilon_1}, V^*_{\varepsilon_2}, \ldots, V^*_{\varepsilon_\ell}$: see Sym1, Sym2, Mod1, Mod2, Mod3 in Section 5 and Sph1, Sph2, Sph3 in Section 6. Once these objects are defined the verifications of the above technical hypothesis are very uniform for the different varieties in the applications. In particular this recipe hints how many nodes to add to the Dynkin diagram of G in order to obtain K; for the symmetric varieties just one node while for the model varieties and another class of spherical variety (see below) two nodes are needed.

Our previous paper [4] follows the above general framework applying it to certain classes of symmetric varieties. Notice however that in that paper the proof of the existence of a standard monomial theory derived by that of the bigger group K is wrong; there we tacitly assumed that a certain map is G–equivariant and this is not the case in general. However Theorem 6 of this paper amends this gap.

The second aim of this paper is the application of the above described framework to the model varieties of type A, B and C. A homogeneous model variety for a semisimple group G is a quasi affine variety whose coordinate ring is the sum of all irreducible representations of G with multiplicity one. These varieties were introduced by Gelfand in [1] and studied by Gelfand and Zelevinsky in [7] and [8]. In particular for a homogeneous model variety G/H we have $\Omega^+ = \Lambda^+$.

In the cited papers the authors provided an embedding of the model varieties for classical groups as an open subset of a grassmannian of a bigger finite dimensional group; hence there are some similarities with our program. From the geometrical viewpoint the construction of Gelfand and Zelevinsky is more natural than our approach. However their embedding is not suitable for the application to the standard monomial theory having as generators a basis of $V^*_{\varepsilon_1} \oplus V^*_{\varepsilon_2} \oplus \cdots \oplus V^*_{\varepsilon_\ell}$. Indeed it is for this purpose that we need to use a more complicated infinite dimensional grassmannian for model varieties of type B and C. The two approaches coincide for the model variety of type A for which we use a finite dimensional lagrangian grassmannian.

Finally we present a further application of our framework to another class of spherical varieties listed as (15) in the paper [2] page 656. For this example the recipe for the construction of K is a bit different of the above reported one; we have included this class of varieties as an illustration of how our program may be applied in other cases.

The paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we introduce some general notations and symbols we use in the other sections. In Section 3 we review the standard monomial theory structure for flag, Schubert and Richardson varieties. Moreover we introduce the class of ridge Richardson varieties which plays a fundamental role in our theory. In Section 4 we present a general framework for the reduction of the equations of certain varieties to those of a suitable grassmannian. In the next Section 5 we apply this construction to the case of model varieties of type A, B and C. Finally, as an example of possible further applications, we see in Section 6 how our theory may be applied to another class of spherical varieties.

Acknowledgements. We would like to thank Paolo Bravi for useful conversations.

2. General assumptions, conventions and notations

All groups, varieties and ind-varieties are over a fixed algebraically closed field $\Bbbk$ of characteristic zero.

We denote by K a Kac–Moody group constructed as in Kumar's book [10] ch. VI, and we denote with $\mathfrak{K}$ its Lie algebra; we always assume that K is symmetrizable. Further we use the following notations and make the following assumptions:

- $T_K \subset B_K \subset K$ are a maximal torus and a Borel subgroup of K, respectively, and $\mathfrak{t}_K \subset \mathfrak{b}_K$ are their Lie algebras;
- Λ_K is the character lattice of T_K and $\Phi_K \subset \Lambda$ is the set of roots;
- $\Delta_K \subset \Phi_K$ is the set of simple roots determined by B_K and for each $\alpha \in \Delta_K$ we denote by $\alpha^\vee \in \mathfrak{t}_K$ the corresponding coroot;
- we assume that there exists a set of fundamental weights in Λ_K: that is a set $\{\tilde{\omega}_\alpha : \alpha \in \Delta_K\}$ such that $\langle \alpha^\vee ; \tilde{\omega}_\beta \rangle = \delta_{\alpha\beta}$ for all $\alpha, \beta \in \Delta_K$ (in Kumar construction in [10] such a set always exists);
- for all $\lambda, \mu \in \Lambda_K$ we write $\lambda \equiv \mu$ if $\langle \alpha^\vee ; \lambda \rangle = \langle \alpha^\vee ; \mu \rangle$ for all $\alpha \in \Delta_K$;
- W_K denotes the Weyl group of K w.r.t. T_K, and, for a real root $\alpha \in \Phi_K$, we denote by s_α the reflection defined by α;
- for a standard Levi L relative to T_K, B_K, we set $T_L \doteq T_K$, $B_L \doteq B_K \cap L$, hence $\Delta_L \subset \Delta_K$, $W_L \subset W_K$; further $W^L \subset W_K$ denotes the set of minimal representatives of W_K / W_L;
- for a parabolic $P \supset B_K$, we define $W_P \doteq W_L$, $W^P \doteq W^L$ where L is the standard Levi of P,
- for $u \in W_K$, lenght(u) is the length of u with respect to Δ_K.

3. Standard monomial theory

We recall the definition of a standard monomial theory.

Let A be a commutative $\Bbbk$-algebra. Let $\mathbb{A}$ be a finite subset of A and let $\leftarrow$ be a transitive antisymmetric binary relation (*t.a.b.r.* for short) on $\mathbb{A}$. (Note, $\leftarrow$ is not necessarily reflexive.) If $a_1 \leftarrow a_2 \leftarrow \cdots \leftarrow a_n$, then we say that the monomial $a_1 \cdot a_2 \cdots a_n$ is a *standard monomial*. We denote by $\mathbb{SM}(\mathbb{A})$ the set of all standard monomials. We say that $(\mathbb{A}, \leftarrow)$ is a standard monomial theory (for short SMT) for A if $\mathbb{SM}(\mathbb{A})$ is a $\Bbbk$-basis of A.

The construction of a standard monomial theory often comes together with the description of the straightening relations, i.e. a set of relations in the elements of $\mathbb{A}$ which provide an inductive procedure to rewrite a non-standard monomial as a linear combination of standard monomials. Let us explain this in more details.

Let $(\mathbb{A}, \leftarrow)$ be a SMT for the ring A. In particular, $\mathbb{A}$ generates A and we denote by Rel_A the kernel of the natural morphism from the symmetric algebra $\mathsf{S}(\mathbb{A})$ to A. Let $\mathbb{M}(\mathbb{A}) \subset \mathsf{S}(\mathbb{A})$ be the set of all monomials in the set of generators $\mathbb{A}$ and let $<_t$ be a monomial order which refines the t.a.b.r. on $\mathbb{A}$. (We recall that a monomial order is a total order on the set of monomials such that: (i) if m, m', m'' are monomials and $m' <_t m''$ then $mm' <_t mm''$ and (ii) $1 <_t m$ for all monomials $m \neq 1$ (see [6], section 15.2).) For any two $a, a' \in \mathbb{A}$ which are not $\leftarrow$comparable assume that there exists a relation $R_{a,a'} \in Rel_A$ such that

$$R_{a,a'} = a\, a' - P_{a,a'}$$

and $P_{a,a'}$ is a sum of monomials which are strictly smaller than $a\,a'$ with respect to the order $<_t$. A set of relations satisfying these properties is called a set of *straightening relations*. We have the following simple lemma (see [4] Lemma 10).

Lemma 1. *Let $(\mathbb{A}, \leftarrow)$ be a SMT for the ring A and let $\mathcal{R} = \{R_{a,a'} \,:\, a, a' \in \mathbb{A}$ are not $\leftarrow$ comparable $\}$ be a set of straightening relations. Then $\mathcal{R}$ generates Rel_A.*

3.1. **Standard monomial theory for flag and Schubert varieties.** Let A be the coordinate ring of the cone over a generalized flag variety $\mathcal{F}$ of a symmetrizable Kac-Moody group K. For this type of algebras a standard monomial theory has been constructed in [13] and [3]. We recall the main properties of this SMT.

Let $\mathcal{L}$ be an ample line bundle over $\mathcal{F}$ and consider the ring $\Gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{L}) = \bigoplus_{n\geqslant 0} \Gamma(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L}^n)$. A basis $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{L})$ of $\Gamma(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L})$ has been constructed in [13] together with a t.a.b.r. $\leftarrow$ on this set such that $(\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{L}), \leftarrow)$ is a SMT for $\Gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{L})$. We write simply $\mathbb{F}$, $\Gamma_{\mathcal{F}}$ for $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{L}), \Gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{L})$ when no confusion arises.

We denote by $\mathbb{SM}(n, \mathcal{L})$ the set of standard monomials of degree n, by $\mathbb{SM}(\mathcal{L})$ the set of all standard monomials and by $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{L})$ the set of all monomials in the set of generators $\mathbb{F}(\mathcal{L})$. For $f, f' \in \mathbb{F}(\mathcal{L})$ which are not $\leftarrow$comparable, the product $f\,f'$ can be expressed as a sum $P_{f,f'}$ of standard monomials of degree two. In [3] a total order $<_t$ has been introduced on $\mathbb{M}(\mathcal{L})$ with the properties required in the previous discussion of a general SMT, so that the relations $R_{f,f'} = f\,f' - P_{f,f'}$ form a set of straightening relations. These relations are called Plücker relations since they generalize the usual Plücker relations for the Grassmannian.

Furthermore, this theory is adapted to Schubert varieties. Let $\mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{F}$ be a closed B_K–stable subvariety and set $\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{L}) = \bigoplus_{n\geqslant 0} \Gamma(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}^n\big|_{\mathcal{S}})$. Denote by $r : \Gamma_{\mathcal{F}}(\mathcal{L}) \longrightarrow \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{L})$ the restriction map, let $I_{\mathcal{S}}$ be its kernel and define $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{L}) \doteq \{a \in \mathbb{F}(\mathcal{L}) \,:\, r(a) \neq 0\}$. Then the set $\{r(a) \,:\, a \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{L})\}$ with the t.a.b.r. induced by the t.a.b.r. $\leftarrow$ of $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}}$ realizes a SMT for $\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{L})$ and the monomials $m \in \mathbb{SM}(\mathcal{L})$ which contain elements not in $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}}(\mathcal{L})$ form a $\Bbbk$-basis of $I_{\mathcal{S}}$. We define also a "restriction" map, that we also denote with the symbol $r : \mathsf{S}(\mathbb{F}) \longrightarrow \mathsf{S}(\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}})$ by sending to zero all the elements of $\mathbb{F} \smallsetminus \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}}$ and we notice that the restrictions $r(R_{f,f'}) \in \mathsf{S}^2(\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}})$ of the relations $R_{f,f'}$ to $\mathcal{S}$, for $f, f' \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}}$ which are not $\leftarrow$comparable, form a set of straightening relations. Summarizing we have:

Theorem 2 ([13])**.**

i) *$(\mathbb{F}, \leftarrow)$ is a SMT for $\Gamma_{\mathcal{F}}$, and the relations $R_{f,f'}$ for $f, f' \in \mathbb{F}$ which are not $\leftarrow$ comparable form a set of straightening relations.*

ii) *$(\{r(a) \mid a \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}}\}, \leftarrow)$ is a SMT for $\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}$, and the relations $r(R_{f,f'}) \in \mathsf{S}^2(\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}})$ for $f, f' \in \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}}$ which are not $\leftarrow$ comparable form a set of straightening relations. Moreover, the kernel $I_{\mathcal{S}}$ of the restriction map has a $\Bbbk$-basis consisting of the set of all standard monomials which contain elements not in $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}}$.*

The elements of $\mathbb{F}$ are eigenvectors for the action of T_K and we denote by $weight(f)$ the weight of $f \in \mathbb{F}$ w.r.t. the action of T_K. The t.a.b.r. $\leftarrow$ is compatible with the dominant order in the following way: if $f \leftarrow f'$ and $f \neq f'$ then $weight(f) < weight(f')$ w.r.t. the dominant order. Moreover $\mathbb{F}$ has a minimum f_0 which is a lowest weight vector.

A Richardson variety is the closure of the intersection of a B_K–orbit with an orbit of the Borel subgroup opposite to B_K. A SMT for general Richardson varieties has been constructed by Lakshmibai and Littelmann [11]. In this paper we are interested in a particular case of this construction, namely given a Schubert variety $\mathcal{S}$ we will consider the Richardson variety $\mathcal{S}_0 = \{y \in \mathcal{S} \,:\, f_0(y) = 0\}$. The above described SMT and Theorem 2 for $\mathcal{S}$ immediately generalize to $\mathcal{S}_0$ by choosing as set of generators $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}_0} = \mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{S}} \smallsetminus \{f_0\}$.

3.2. **Ridge Richardson varieties and compatibility with Levi factors.** Let L be a finite type standard Levi of K and let $\mathcal{R}$ be an L–invariant Richardson variety. The inclusion $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{L}) \subset \mathbb{F}(\mathcal{L})$ gives an inclusion $s_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{R}} = s_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{L}) : \Gamma(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{L}) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L})$; this inclusion is not L–equivariant is general, moreover even when this map is L–equivariant one can not derive that $s_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{R}}(\mathcal{L}^i)$ is L–equivariant for $i > 1$.

Let λ be the lowest weight of $\Gamma(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L})$. A L–stable Richardson variety $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{F}$ is said *extremal* (w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}$) if the lowest weights of the irreducible L–submodules of $\Gamma(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{L})$ are in the W_K–orbit of λ.

As noted in [4], by the definition of Littelmann basis one has that if $\mathcal{R}$ is extremal then $s_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{R}}$ is L–equivariant.

Now we define a class of L–stable extremal Richardson varieties for which we can describe the coordinate ring. Let Q be the standard parabolic such that $\mathcal{F} = K/Q$, let $w_0, w_1, \cdots, w_\ell \in W^Q$ be a sequence of minimal representatives with the following properties:

- $w_0 = e$, $w_h = s_{\gamma_h} u_h w_{h-1}$ with $\gamma_h \in \Delta_K \setminus \Delta_L$ and $u_i \in W_L$ for $h = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell$;
- $\text{lenght}(w_h) = 1 + \text{lenght}(u_h) + \text{lenght}(w_{h-1})$ for $h = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell$;
- setting $\lambda_h \doteq -w_h(\lambda)$, we have $\langle \gamma_h^\vee, \lambda_h \rangle = -1$ and $\langle \gamma^\vee, \lambda_h \rangle = 0$ for all $\gamma \in \Delta_K \setminus \Delta_L$ and $\gamma \neq \gamma_h$,
- $u_k(\lambda_h) = \lambda_h$ for $0 \leqslant k \leqslant h$.

Define τ as the minimal representative of $w_L w_\ell$, where w_L the longest element of $W(L)$; let $\mathcal{S} \doteq \overline{B_K \tau Q/Q}$ be the Schubert variety of $\mathcal{F}$ corresponding to τ. The following theorem is proved as Theorem 39 in [4].

Theorem 3. *With the above introduced notations we have: the Schubert variety $\mathcal{S}$ is extremal, L–stable and, moreover, for all $n \geqslant 0$ we have*

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L}^n) = \bigoplus_{0 \leqslant i_1 \leqslant i_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant i_n \leqslant \ell} V^*_{\lambda_{i_1} + \lambda_{i_2} + \cdots + \lambda_{i_n}}$$

as L–modules.

If $L \subset Q$ then the lowest weight vector f_0 of $\Gamma(\mathcal{S}, \mathcal{L})$ is an L–eigenvector and the Richardson variety $\mathcal{S}_0$ is L–stable. So we have the following corollary (see Corollary 40 in [4]).

Corollary 4. *The Richardson variety $\mathcal{S}_0$ is an L–stable extremal Richardson variety and for all $n \geqslant 0$,*

$$\Gamma(\mathcal{S}_0, \mathcal{L}^n) = \bigoplus_{1 \leqslant i_1 \leqslant i_2 \leqslant \cdots \leqslant i_n \leqslant \ell} V^*_{\lambda_{i_1} + \lambda_{i_2} + \cdots + \lambda_{i_n}}$$

as L–modules.

We call $\mathcal{S}_0$ the *ridge* Richardson variety defined by $w_0, \ldots, w_\ell$.

4. PLÜCKERIZATION

In this section we propose a general pattern for determining a SMT and the straightening relations of the coordinate ring of a spherical homogeneous variety. This method does not always work, nevertheless it works in some interesting cases we present in the next sections. We call this method *plückerization* since it reduces the computation of the relations of a ring to the Plücker relations for a generalized flag variety. The main ingredient is the introduction of a bigger group of symmetries into the problem.

In what follows we denote by G a fixed semisimple, connected and simply connected algebraic group, $\mathfrak{g}$ its Lie algebra and $G \longrightarrow \bar{G}$ an isogeny. We denote all the objects defined in Section 2 $\mathfrak{t}_G, \mathfrak{b}_G$, etc. simply by $\mathfrak{t}, \mathfrak{b}$, etc. without the subscript G. The fundamental weights of $\mathfrak{g}$ will be denoted by ω_α, $\alpha \in \Delta$.

Let H be an algebraic subgroup of G, $X \doteq G/H$ and A the coordinate ring $\Bbbk[X]$. We assume that X is spherical, so every irreducible representation appears in A with multiplicity at most one. Let $\Omega_A^+ = \{\lambda \in \Lambda^+ : V_\lambda^H \neq 0\}$ so that $A \simeq \bigoplus_{\lambda \in \Omega_A^+} V_\lambda^*$ as a G-module. If M and N are vector subspaces of A we denote by $M \cdot N$ the vector space spanned by the products $m \cdot n$ with $m \in M$ and $n \in N$ in the ring A.

In order to develop our method we need to assume various hypothesis on A that we denote by Hp1, Hp2,... First of all notice that Ω_A^+ is a submonoid of Λ; we assume

Hp1: Ω_A^+ is a free monoid and we denote with $\varepsilon_1, \varepsilon_2, ..., \varepsilon_\ell$ its basis.

We define A_j as the sum of all modules V_λ^* with $\lambda = \sum_i a_i\varepsilon_i$ and $\sum a_i = j$ and $A'_j \doteq \bigoplus_{i\leqslant j} A_i$. Notice that, being X irreducible, the product $V_\lambda^* \cdot V_\mu^*$ in the ring A contains $V_{\lambda+\mu}^*$. Hence $A'_i \cdot A'_j = A'_{i+j}$, and A is generated by A_1 as a $\Bbbk$–algebra. Our aim is to describe the ring A with respect to this natural choice of generators. We denote by Rel_A the kernel of the natural map $\psi : \mathsf{S}(A_1) \longrightarrow A$.

The heart of our assumption is the existence of a Richardson variety whose coordinate ring is isomorphic to A as a G–module. Let K be a Kac-Moody group which contains G as the semisimple part of a Levi factor L. Let B_K be a Borel subgroup of K such that $B_K \cap G = B$, $T_K \subset B_K$ a maximal torus of K containing T, Λ_K the set of weights of T_K, $\Delta_K \supset \Delta$ the set of simple roots of K w.r.t. these choices and $\Delta_0 \doteq \Delta_K \smallsetminus \Delta$. Let Q be a parabolic of K containing G, $\mathcal{F} \doteq K/Q$ the associated generalized flag variety, $\mathcal{L}$ an ample equivariant line bundle on $\mathcal{F}$ and $\mathcal{R} \subset \mathcal{F}$ a G–stable ridge Richardson variety w.r.t. $\mathcal{L}$. Finally let $s_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{R}} : \Gamma(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{L}) \longrightarrow \Gamma(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L})$ be the map induced by the SMT as in the previous section. Our main hypothesis is the following:

Hp2: for all i we have $A_i \simeq \Gamma(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{L}^i)$ as G–modules, in particular $A \simeq \Gamma_{\mathcal{R}}$.

In order to relate the ring $\Gamma_{\mathcal{R}}$ and A we need also the following assumptions

Hp3: there exists a G–equivariant morphism of $\Bbbk$–algebras $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{F}} \longrightarrow A$. We define $\varphi_i \doteq \varphi\big|_{\Gamma(\mathcal{F},\mathcal{L}^i)}$.

Hp4: $\bar\varphi \doteq \varphi_1 \circ s_{\mathcal{F}}^{\mathcal{R}} : \Gamma(\mathcal{R}, \mathcal{L}) \longrightarrow A_1$ is an isomorphism of G–modules ($\bar\varphi$ is G–equivariant since $\mathcal{R}$ is a G–stable ridge Richardson variety).

Hypothesis Hp2, Hp3 and Hp4 allow to relate the ring A and the SMT for $\mathcal{R}$ and the Plücker relations for $\mathcal{F}$. Let $Z^* \doteq \Gamma(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L})$ and let $(\mathbb{F}, \leftarrow)$ be the SMT for $\Gamma_{\mathcal{F}}$ explained in the previous section and $\mathbb{F}_{\mathcal{R}} \subset \mathbb{F}$ the subset of elements not vanishing on $\mathcal{R}$. We keep the notations of Section 3.1. For $m \in \mathbb{M}$ we define $g_m = \varphi(m) \in A$ and $\mathbb{G}_0 \doteq \{g_f : f \in \mathbb{F}_0\}$. On $\mathbb{G}_0$ we define the same t.a.b.r. of $\mathbb{F}$; that is $g_f \leftarrow g_{f'}$ if and only if $f \leftarrow f'$. In order to avoid possible confusion between expression in $\mathsf{S}(\mathbb{G}_0)$ and elements in A, we introduce the ring $\Bbbk[u] \doteq \Bbbk[u_f : f \in \mathbb{F}_0]$. If $m = f_1 \cdots f_s \in \mathbb{M}_0$ let $u_m \doteq u_{f_1} \cdots u_{f_s}$ be the corresponding monomial in $\Bbbk[u]$. By Hp4, $\mathbb{G}_0$ is a basis of A_1 so $\mathsf{S}(A_1) = \Bbbk[u]$ and the map $\psi : \Bbbk[u] \longrightarrow A$ is given by $\psi(u_f) \doteq g_f$.

Notice also that by hypothesis Hp4, by being $\mathcal{R}$ a G–stable ridge Richardson variety and by the results of Section 3.2, we have a partition $\mathbb{F}_0 = \coprod_{i=1}^{\ell} \mathbb{F}_0(\varepsilon_i)$; where $\mathbb{F}_0(\varepsilon_i)$ is a basis of a G–submodule of Z^* isomorphic to $V_{\varepsilon_i}^*$.

We now introduce an order on G–modules and some compatibility conditions with a G–stable decomposition of Z^*. The space $Z^* = \Gamma(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L})$ is an integrable lowest weight irreducible representation of K; let ζ be its lowest weight and $f_0 \in \mathbb{F}$ a lowest weight vector in Z^*. Let C be the identity component of the subgroup of elements of T_K which commute with G.

We can decompose Z^* into isotypic components w.r.t. the action of C, these are described as follows: if $\eta \in \mathbb{N}[\Delta_0]$ we define Z_η^* as the subspace generated by all T_K–weight vectors whose weight is equal to $\zeta + \eta + \gamma$ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}[\Delta]$. These subspaces are finite dimensional and G–stable. If $\eta = \sum_{\alpha\in\Delta_0} a_\alpha\alpha$ we define $ht_0(\eta) \doteq \sum a_\alpha$ and we set $Z_n^* \doteq \bigoplus Z_\eta^*$ where the sum is over all the elements $\eta \in \mathbb{N}[\Delta_0]$ such that $ht_0(\eta) = n$.

In our application we define an additive map $\mathsf{gr} : \Omega_A^+ \longrightarrow \mathbb{N}$ such that the following properties hold. If M is any G–module and $n \in \mathbb{N}$ we define $M_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant n}$ as the sum of all isotypic components of type V_λ^* with $\lambda \in \Omega_A^+$ and $\mathsf{gr}(\lambda) \leqslant n$. We make the following hypothesis:

Hp5: For all $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \Omega_A^+$ if $V_\nu^* \subset V_\lambda^* \otimes V_\mu^*$ then $\mathsf{gr}(\nu) \leqslant \mathsf{gr}(\lambda) + \mathsf{gr}(\mu)$.

Hp6: For all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ if M is a G–irreducible submodule of Z_n^* of highest weight $\lambda \in \Omega_A^+$ then $\mathsf{gr}(\lambda) \leqslant n$. Further, equality holds if and only if either $n \leqslant \ell$ and M is the span of $\mathbb{F}_0(\varepsilon_n)$ or $n = 0$ and $M = \Bbbk f_0$.

Notice that a combinatorial condition which implies Hp5 is the following: for all $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \Omega_A^+$ if $\nu \leqslant \lambda + \mu$ then $\mathsf{gr}(\nu) \leqslant \mathsf{gr}(\lambda) + \mathsf{gr}(\mu)$. Let n_A be such that $\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_i) \leqslant n_A$ for all i. Under Hp5 we have that

$A_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant n}\cdot A_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant m}\subset A_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant n+m}$ and if $n,m\geqslant n_A$ then $A_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant n}\cdot A_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant m}=A_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant n+m}$. Since $\mathcal{R}$ is irreducible, the same properties hold for $(\Gamma_{\mathcal{R}})_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant n}$ too.

We introduce on $\Bbbk[u]$ a degree according to the map gr: for $f\in\mathbb{F}_0(\varepsilon_i)$ set the degree of u_f equal to $\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_i)$ and denote by $\mathsf{gr}(r)\in\mathbb{N}$ the degree of an element r in $\Bbbk[u]$. If $m,m'\in\mathbb{M}_0$, then we define $u_m\prec_t u_{m'}$ if either $\mathsf{gr}(u_m)<\mathsf{gr}(u_{m'})$ or $\mathsf{gr}(u_m)=\mathsf{gr}(u_{m'})$ and $m<_t m'$. The last hypothesis is the following

Hp7: $\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_1)<\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_2)<\cdots<\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_\ell)$.

Notice that this hypothesis implies that the order $\prec_t$ is compatible with the $\leftarrow$ order on $\mathbb{G}_0$.

We are now ready to introduce the straightening relations. If $f_1,f_2\in\mathbb{F}_0$ are not $\leftarrow$ comparable let $R_{f_1,f_2}=f_1f_2-P_{f_1,f_2}\in\mathsf{S}^2(Z^*)$ be the straightening relation for $\Gamma_{\mathcal{G}r}$. Applying φ to this relation we have a relation on the ring A. However the polynomial P_{f_1,f_2} is not just a polynomial in the variables $\mathbb{F}_0$ but also in other variables in $\mathbb{F}$. Let $\mathbb{F}_2$ be the subset of $\mathbb{F}$ which span $\bigoplus Z_n^*$ with $n\leqslant 2n_A$. Let $\mathbb{F}_3\doteq\mathbb{F}_2\smallsetminus\mathbb{F}_0$. Since the relations are T_K–homogeneous (hence C–homogeneous) the polynomial P_{f_1,f_2} can be written as $P^0_{f_1,f_2}+P^1_{f_1,f_2}$ where P^0 is the sum of all the monomials whose variables are in $\mathbb{F}_0$ and P^1 is a sum of monomials whose variables are in $\mathbb{F}_3$ or mixed in $\mathbb{F}_0$ and $\mathbb{F}_3$. For some applications (mainly to describe an equivariant deformation of A to $\Gamma_{\mathcal{R}}$), it will be convenient to change the basis $\mathbb{F}_3$. The span of $\mathbb{F}_3$ is G–stable but the basis is not compatible with the decomposition of Z^* in G–submodules. Let $\mathbb{F}_1$ be a basis of T_K which span the same subspace than $\mathbb{F}_3$ but that is compatible with the decomposition of Z^* into G–submodules. So we can consider P^1 also as a combination of monomials in the variables $\mathbb{F}_1$ or mixed in $\mathbb{F}_1$ and $\mathbb{F}_0$. For each $f\in\mathbb{F}_1$ let $\lambda_f\in\Lambda$ such that the G–module generated by f is isomorphic to $V^*_{\lambda_f}$. If $\lambda_f\notin\Omega_A^+$ then $\varphi(f)=0$ and, on the other hand, if $\lambda_f=\sum_i a_i\varepsilon_i$ then the multiplication $V^{*a_1}_{\varepsilon_1}\cdots V^{*a_\ell}_{\varepsilon_\ell}$ contains the module $V^*_{\lambda_f}$, hence there exists a polynomial $F_f(u)\in\Bbbk[u]$ with $\mathsf{gr}(F_f(u))=\mathsf{gr}(\lambda_f)$ such that $\psi(F_f)=\varphi(f)$.

Remark 5. Notice that, once we know $\varphi(f)$, the computation of the polynomial F_f does not depend on the knowledge of the multiplication in the ring A but only on the projection $\mathsf{S}^{a_1}(V^*_{\varepsilon_1})\otimes\cdots\otimes\mathsf{S}^{a_\ell}(V^*_{\varepsilon_\ell})\longrightarrow V^*_{\lambda_f}$ which, up to a non zero scalar, is uniquely determined by the requirement to be G–equivariant.

Now we define the polynomial $\hat{P}^0_{f_1,f_2}(u)$ and $\hat{P}^1_{f_1,f_2}(u)$ in $\Bbbk[u]$. The polynomial $\hat{P}^0$ is obtained from P^0 just by replacing the variable $f\in\mathbb{F}_0$ with u_f, and the polynomial $\hat{P}^1$ is obtained from P^1 by replacing the variable $f\in\mathbb{F}_0$ with u_f and the variable $f\in\mathbb{F}_1$ with $F_f(u)$. The straightening relation is then defined as

$$\hat{R}_{f_1,f_2}(u)\doteq u_{f_1}\,u_{f_1}-\hat{P}^0_{f_1,f_2}(u)-\hat{P}^1_{f_1,f_2}(u).$$

Theorem 6. *If* Hp1, Hp2,...,Hp7*hold then*

i) for $f_1,f_2\in\mathbb{F}_0$ not $\leftarrow$ comparable the relations $\hat{R}_{f_1,f_2}(u)$ is a straightening relation w.r.t. $\prec_t$.

ii) $(\mathbb{G}_0,\leftarrow)$ is a SMT for A.

Proof. Let $f_1\in\mathbb{F}_0(\varepsilon_i)$ and $f_2\in\mathbb{F}_0(\varepsilon_j)$. The relations R_{f_1,f_2} are T_K–homogeneous. By Hp6 this implies that $\hat{P}^0$ is homogeneous w.r.t. gr with degree equal to $\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_i+\varepsilon_j)$ and that $\mathsf{gr}(\hat{P}^1)<\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_i+\varepsilon_j)$. This immediately implies that $\hat{R}_{f_1,f_2}$ is a straightening relations w.r.t. $\prec_t$.

Hence the monomials g_m with $m\in\mathbb{SM}_0$ generate A as a $\Bbbk$–vector space. We want to prove that they are a basis. Notice that $\{g_m : m\in\mathbb{M}_0 \text{ and } \mathsf{gr}(u_m)\leqslant n\}$ spans $A_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant n}$ for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$ and, using that $\hat{R}$ are straightening relations, it follows that $\{g_m : m\in\mathbb{SM}_0 \text{ and } \mathsf{gr}(u_m)\leqslant n\}$ spans $A_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant n}$ for every $n\in\mathbb{N}$. Similarly, since $\mathcal{R}$ is irreducible, $(\Gamma_{\mathcal{R}})_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant n}$ is spanned by $\{m\in\mathbb{SM}_0 \text{ and } \mathsf{gr}(u_m)\leqslant n\}$ and moreover these are linearly independent elements. Now the thesis follows since $(\Gamma_{\mathcal{R}})_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant n}$ and $A_{\mathsf{gr}\leqslant n}$ are finite dimensional and, being isomorphic as G–modules, they have the same dimension. ☐

We want to remark that in our previous paper [4] the proof of the existence of a SMT was wrong; inded we tacitly assumed that the map $\Gamma_{\mathcal{R}}\longrightarrow\Gamma_{\mathcal{F}}$ induced by the standard monomial theory is G–equivariant which was not the case. Under that assumption we could prove the existence of a SMT independently of the existence of straightening relations. The proof of the straightening relations is, even if stated in a slightly more general setting, the same we gave in [4] and, as seen above, they imply also the existence of the SMT.

Corollary 7. *There exists a two steps $\Bbbk^* \times G$–equivariant flat degeneration of A to $\Gamma_{\mathcal{R}}$.*

Proof. Let $\mathcal{S} \doteq \overline{B_K \mathcal{R}}$ be the smallest Schubert variety containing $\mathcal{R}$ and let $\Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}$ its ring of coordinates. Since $\mathcal{R}$ is a ridge Schubert variety we know that $\Gamma_{\mathcal{R}} = \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}/(f_0)$. The function $\varphi(f_0)$ is G–invariant (since $G \subset Q$) so it is a constant function; let it be equal to $c \in \Bbbk$. Let $B \doteq \Gamma_{\mathcal{S}}/(f_0 - c)$. It is clear that the ring B can be deformed to $\Gamma_{\mathcal{R}}$ in a flat and $\Bbbk^* \times G$–equivariant way. We exhibit now a $\Bbbk^* \times G$–equivariant deformation of A to B. If $f \in \mathbb{F}_1$ let v_f be a new variable and if $f \in Z_n^*$ set either $\chi_f \doteq n - \mathsf{gr}(\lambda_f)$ if $\lambda_f \in \Omega_A^+$ and $\chi_f \doteq 0$ otherwise (for the definition of λ_f see the paragraph before Remark 5). By Hp6, $\chi_f > 0$ for all $f \in \mathbb{F}_1 \smallsetminus \{f_0\}$.

Consider now the polynomial ring $\Bbbk[u, v, t]$ in the variables u_f with $f \in \mathbb{F}_0$, v_f with $f \in \mathbb{F}_1$ and t. For $f_1, f_2 \in \mathbb{F}_0$ not $\leftarrow$ comparable let $R'_{f_1,f_2}(u, v)$ be obtained from R_{f_1,f_2} by replacing f with either u_f if $f \in \mathbb{F}_0$ or with v_f if otherwise $f \in \mathbb{F}_1$. Consider the quotient D of $\Bbbk[u, v, t]$ by the ideal generated by the polynomials $R'_{f_1,f_2}(u, v)$ for $f_1, f_2 \in \mathbb{F}_0$ not $\leftarrow$ comparable and by the polynomials $v_f - t^{\chi_f} F_f(u)$ for $f \in \mathbb{F}_1$. Notice that on D there is an action of G, indeed the ideal generated by the polynomials R' is G–invariant since $\mathcal{R}$ is G–stable and the ideal generated by relations $v_f - t^{\chi_f} F_f(u)$ is invariant since F_f is induced by the G–equivariant projection $\mathsf{S}^{a_1}(V^*_{\varepsilon_1}) \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathsf{S}^{a_\ell}(V^*_{\varepsilon_\ell}) \longrightarrow V^*_{\lambda_f}$. On D there is also an action of $\Bbbk^*$ defined by $z \cdot u_f \doteq \eta(z)\, u_f$, $z \cdot v_f \doteq z^n\, v_f$ if $f \in Z_n^*$ and $z \cdot t \doteq z\, t$.

Finally for $a \in \Bbbk^{\Delta_0}$ let $D_a \doteq D/(t_\alpha - a_\alpha$ for $\alpha \in \Delta)$ and notice that $D_0 \simeq B$ and $D_{(1,\ldots,1)} \simeq A$ by the previous Proposition.

The flatness of the deformation follows by Hp2. □

5. The case of model varieties

In this section we explain how to construct K and $\mathcal{R}$ for the model varieties of $\mathsf{SL}(n)$, $\mathsf{SO}(2n+1)$ and $\mathsf{Sp}(2n)$. The construction we are going to see is a generalization of the one we gave in [4] for symmetric varieties with restricted root system of types A, B, C or BC. This approach has some general pattern that we want to make evident here and we hope that, with few variations, it could be applied also in other cases.

Let us recall our construction for symmetric varieties whose restricted root systems is of type A, B, BC or C, in the context of the general approach of this paper. In [4] we used the following two main properties for the construction of K and $\mathcal{R}$. If we properly order the weights $\varepsilon_1, \ldots, \varepsilon_\ell$ then

- Sym1: (Lemma 41 in [4]) For $1 \leqslant i \leqslant \ell - 1$ there exists $u_i \in W$ such that $u_i \varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_{i+1} - \varepsilon_1$. In particular $V_{\varepsilon_{i+1}}$ appears with multiplicity one in $V_{\varepsilon_i} \otimes V_{\varepsilon_1}$;
- Sym2: (Corollary 20 in [4]) $V^*_{\varepsilon_{i+1}} \subset V^*_{\varepsilon_1} \cdot V^*_{\varepsilon_i}$ in the coordinate ring A of the symmetric variety, for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell - 1$.

The second property is related to the Dynkin diagram of K being constructed by adding a single node (associated to the root α_0) to the Dynkin diagram of G. While the first property allows to define a ridge Richardson variety with the required properties by setting $w_0 \doteq \mathrm{id}$, $w_1 \doteq s_{\alpha_0}$ and $w_{i+1} \doteq s_{\alpha_0} u_i w_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, \ell - 1$.

We want now to briefly see how the various hypothesis Hp1,...,Hp7 are stated in [4]. Hp1 follows by the description of spherical weights in Section 1 in [4]). The hypothesis Hp2, Hp3 and Hp4 follow by Corollary 40, Lemma 43 and Theorem 42 respectively in [4]. The map gr is defined by $\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_i) = i$, so Hp7is clear, and for Hp5 one may look at the remark before Proposition 35 at page 322 in [4] since, with notation as in Hp5, $\lambda + \mu - \nu$ is a rational non–negative linear combination of simple roots of the restricted root system. Finally Hp6 follows by Corollary 37 in [4].

In the case of model varieties property Sym1 holds without any change while property Sym2 is not true any more. Before giving the details of the construction of K and $\mathcal{R}$ for model varieties we recall some properties of these varieties.

5.1. **Model varieties.** A homogeneous model variety for a semisimple group $\bar{G}$ is a quasi affine variety whose coordinate ring is the sum of all irreducible representations of $\bar{G}$ with multiplicity one. These varieties were studied by Gelfand and Zelevinsky in [8, 7, 1]. In particular for a homogeneous model variety $\bar{G}/\bar{H}$ we have $\Omega^+_A = \Lambda^+_{\bar{G}}$.

As proved in [14], for a simple group $\bar{G}$ of rank r there exist 2^r homogeneous model varieties up to isomorphism and there exists exactly one model variety such that all the other model varieties are degeneration of this variety. We want to describe a Plückerization of the coordinate ring of this variety in the case $\bar{G} = \mathsf{SL}(\ell+1)$, $\bar{G} = \mathsf{SO}(2\ell+1)$ and $\bar{G} = \mathsf{Sp}(2\ell)$. We denote by G the universal cover of $\bar{G}$ and by H the inverse image of $\bar{H}$ in G so that $X = G/H = \bar{G}/\bar{H}$. If we order the Dynkin diagram of G as in Bourbaki, we can choose a basis of Ω^+_A as follows: $\varepsilon_i \doteq \omega_i$ for all i but $i = \ell$ and $G = \mathsf{SO}(2\ell+1)$ where we set $\varepsilon_\ell \doteq 2\omega_\ell$. In particular Hp1 is satisfied.

We denote by h_i an H–invariant non zero element of V_{ε_i}. We now describe $\bar{H}$, and h_i case by case.

5.1.1. $\mathsf{SL}(2n+1)$. Here $\ell = 2n$ is even. Let W be an n–dimensional vector space and set $V \doteq W \oplus W^* \oplus \mathbb{C}\, v$. Let a_W be the standard symplectic form on $W \oplus W^*$ and extend it trivially to V. In this case we have $G = \mathsf{SL}(V)$, $H = \{g \in G \, : \, g(v) = v \text{ and } g \cdot a_W = a_W\}$.

We have $h_1 = v$, $h_2 = a_W \in \Lambda^2 V$, $h_{2i} = h_2^{\wedge i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n$, and $h_{2i+1} = h_1 \wedge h_{2i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

Notice also that in this case the model variety G/H is isomorphic to the symmetric variety $\mathsf{SL}(2n+2)/\mathsf{Sp}(2n+2)$.

5.1.2. $\mathsf{SL}(2n)$. Here $\ell = 2n-1$ is odd. Let V be a $2n$–dimensional vector space and fix a non degenerate symplectic form $a_V \in \Lambda^2 V$ and a non zero vector $v \in V$. Then $H = \{g \in \mathsf{SL}(2n) \, : \, gv = v \text{ and } g \cdot a_V = a_V\}$.

We have $h_1 = v$, $h_2 = a_V \in \Lambda^2 V$, $h_{2i} = h_2^{\wedge i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, and $h_{2i+1} = h_1 \wedge h_{2i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$.

5.1.3. $\mathsf{SO}(2\ell+1)$. Let W be an ℓ–dimensional vector space and set $V \doteq W \oplus W^* \oplus \mathbb{C}\, v$. On V define a non degenerate bilinear symmetric form b_V such that W and W^* are orthogonal to v and such that on $W \oplus W^*$ the symmetric form is induced by the pairing between W and W^*. Let also a_W be the standard non degenerate symplectic form on $W \oplus W^*$ and extend it trivially to V. In this case we have $\bar{G} = \mathsf{SO}(V, b_V)$ and $\bar{H} = \mathsf{GL}(W)$ acting naturally on $W \oplus W^*$ and trivially on v.

Notice that we have $V_{\varepsilon_i} = \Lambda^i V$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell$, and also $h_1 = v$, $h_2 = a_W \in \Lambda^2 V$, $h_{2i} = h_2^{\wedge i}$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots,$ and $h_{2i+1} = h_1 \wedge h_{2i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$

5.1.4. $\mathsf{Sp}(2\ell)$. If ℓ is even let W_1 and W_2 be two ℓ–dimensional vector spaces while, if ℓ is odd, let W_1 and W_2 be two vector spaces of dimension $\ell+1$ and $\ell-1$, respectively. Fix two symplectic forms a_{W_1} and a_{W_2} on W_1 and W_2; let $V \doteq W_1 \oplus W_2$, $a_V \doteq a_{W_1} + a_{W_2}$ and $G \doteq \mathsf{Sp}(V, a_V)$. Choose a nonzero vector v in W_1 and define $H_1 \doteq \{g \in \mathsf{Sp}(a_{W_1}) : g(v) = v\}$ and $H_2 \doteq \mathsf{Sp}(a_{W_2})$. Then $H = H_1 \times H_2$.

Notice that $\Lambda^i V \simeq a_V \wedge \Lambda^{i-1} V \oplus V_{\varepsilon_i}$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots, \ell-1$; we denote by $\pi_i : \Lambda^i \longrightarrow V_{\varepsilon_i}$ the projection onto the second factor.

We have $h_1 = v$, $h_2 = \pi_2(a_{W_1})$, $h_{2i} = \pi_{2i}(a_{W_1}^{\wedge i})$, for $i = 1, 2, \dots$, and $h_{2i+1} = \pi_{2i+1}(h_1 \wedge a_{W_1}^{\wedge i})$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots$

We have the following properties similar to Sym1 and Sym2.

Lemma 8. *If G/H is one of the above described model varieties then*

Mod1*: $V_{\varepsilon_i} \subset V_{\varepsilon_1}^{\otimes i}$ with multiplicity one and $V_{\varepsilon_i} \not\subset V_{\varepsilon_1}^{\otimes j}$ for $j < i$;*
Mod2*: $V^*_{\varepsilon_{i+2}} \subset V^*_{\varepsilon_2} \cdot V^*_{\varepsilon_i}$ and $V^*_{\varepsilon_{2i+1}} \subset V^*_{\varepsilon_1} \cdot V^*_{\varepsilon_{2i}}$ in the coordinate ring A;*
Mod3*: for all i there exists an element u_i in the Weyl group W such that $u_i\varepsilon_i = \varepsilon_{i+1} - \varepsilon_1$. More precisely we may choose $u_i = s_1 s_2 \cdots s_i$.*

Proof. Property Mod1 and Mod3 are a straightforward computation.

In order to prove property Mod2 recall that if $\lambda, \mu, \nu \in \Omega^+_A$ and $p : V_\lambda \otimes V_\mu \longrightarrow W$ is the projection on the isotypic component of type V_ν, then the condition $V^*_\nu \subset V^*_\lambda \cdot V^*_\mu$ in the coordinate ring of G/H is equivalent to $p(V^H_\lambda \otimes V^H_\mu) \neq 0$.

Notice also that for $\mathsf{SL}(\ell+1)$ and $\mathsf{SO}(2\ell+1)$ and $\lambda = \varepsilon_i$, $\mu = \varepsilon_j$ and $\nu = \varepsilon_{i+j}$ with $i + j \leqslant \ell$, the projection p is given by $p(x \otimes y) = x \wedge y$; further for $\mathsf{Sp}(2\ell)$ and $\lambda = \varepsilon_i$, $\mu = \varepsilon_j$ and $\nu = \varepsilon_{i+j}$ with $i + j \leqslant \ell$ the projection p is given by $p(\pi_i(x) \otimes \pi_j(y)) = \pi_{i+j}(x \wedge y)$. Hence property Mod2 follows from the description of the elements h_i given above. □

5.2. **Construction of K.** Let $\Delta = \{\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_\ell\}$ be the set of simple roots of $\mathfrak{g}$ numbered as in Bourbaki. For the construction of K we consider the Dynkin diagram of G and we add two nodes so that $\Delta_0 = \{\alpha_0, \beta_0\}$. This choice is suggested by the fact that, by property Mod2, h_1 and h_2 generate all the invariants. We connect both nodes to the node corresponding to the simple root α_1. However in the next Section we see an example where we make a different choice. Notice that K is symmetrizable.

Let L be the Levi whose simple roots are given by Δ and let C be its center, as in Section 4. For an element $\eta \in \mathbb{Z}[\Delta_0]$ we can consider the associated eigenspace $\mathfrak{K}_\eta$ in $\mathfrak{K}$ for the action of C as we have explained in Section 4 for the module Z^*. We define $\mathfrak{K}^-$ as the sum of the eigenspace $\mathfrak{K}_\eta$ for $\eta \in -\mathbb{N}[\Delta_0]$.

The inclusion $\Delta \subset \Delta_K$ determines an inclusion of Λ into Λ_K. However this inclusion does not send fundamental weights to fundamental weights. We denote by $\omega_1, \dots, \omega_\ell \in \Lambda$ the fundamental weights of $\mathfrak{g}$ w.r.t. Δ and by $\tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}, \tilde\omega_{\beta_0}, \tilde\omega_1, \dots, \tilde\omega_\ell \in \Lambda_K$ a choice of fundamental weights for Δ_K as explained in Section 2. If $\lambda = \sum a_i\omega_i$ is an element of Λ we denote by $\tilde\lambda \in \Lambda_K$ the element $\sum_i a_i\tilde\omega_i$.

Lemma 9.

i) $\mathfrak{K}_0 = \mathfrak{g} + \mathfrak{t}_K$*;*
ii) $\mathfrak{K}^-$ *is generated by* $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0}$ *and* $\mathfrak{K}_{-\beta_0}$*;*
iii) $\mathfrak{K}_{-\eta} \simeq \mathfrak{K}^*_\eta$ *as a G–module.*
iv) $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0} \simeq \mathfrak{K}_{-\beta_0} \simeq V_{\varepsilon_1}$ *as a G–module;*
v) the G–module V_{ε_2} *appears in* $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}$ *with multiplicity one.*

Proof. i) and *ii)* are trivial. The T_K character of $\mathfrak{K}_\eta$ is obtained from the character of $\mathfrak{K}_{-\eta}$ by composition with the involution $t \mapsto t^{-1}$, so *iii)* follows.

We prove *iv)* in the case of $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0}$, the proof for $\mathfrak{K}_{-\beta_0}$ is analogous. Let $\mathsf{f}_{\alpha_0}, \mathsf{f}_{\beta_0}, \mathsf{f}_1, \dots, \mathsf{f}_\ell$ be root vectors of weight $-\alpha_0, -\beta_0, -\alpha_1, \dots, -\alpha_\ell$. We prove that f_{α_0} generates $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0}$ as a G–module. Indeed $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0}$ is generated by vectors y of the form $[\mathsf{f}_{i_1}, \dots, [\mathsf{f}_{i_a}, [\mathsf{f}_{\alpha_0}, [\mathsf{f}_{j_1}, \dots, [\mathsf{f}_{j_{b-1}}, \mathsf{f}_{j_b}] \cdots]$ where $i_h, j_k \in \{1, \dots \ell\}$. In particular if we set $x \doteq -[\mathsf{f}_{j_1}, \dots, [\mathsf{f}_{j_{b-1}}, \mathsf{f}_{j_b}] \cdots]$ we have $y = [\mathsf{f}_{i_1}, \dots, [\mathsf{f}_{i_a}, [x, \mathsf{f}_{\alpha_0}] \cdots]$ which is in the G–module generated by f_{α_0}. Finally notice that f_{α_0} is a highest weight vector of weight ε_1 for the action of G.

We now prove *v)*. The weight $\gamma_0 \doteq \alpha_0 + \beta_0 + \alpha_1 \equiv \tilde\omega_{\alpha_0} + \tilde\omega_{\beta_0} - \tilde\varepsilon_2$ is a real root of $\mathfrak{K}$. Let $y \in \mathfrak{K}$ be a non zero element of weight $-\gamma_0$. In particular $y \in \mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}$ is a highest weight vector of weight ε_2 for the action of G, hence V_{ε_2} appears in $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}$ with non zero multiplicity. Moreover all roots $\gamma \in \Phi_K$ which appear with nonzero multiplicity in the space $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}$ are of the form $\gamma = -\gamma_0 - \eta$ with $\eta \in \mathbb{N}[\Delta]$. Hence all other possible G–highest weight vectors in $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}$ have a weight which is strictly smaller than ε_2 w.r.t. dominant order in Λ. In particular V_{ε_2} appears with multiplicity one in $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}$. □

5.3. **Construction of $\mathcal{R}$.** Let Z be the irreducible highest weight module of highest weight $\tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}$. Let Q be the maximal parabolic of K corresponding to the root α_0. Let $\mathcal{F} \doteq K/Q$ and let $\mathcal{L}$ be the line bundle on $\mathcal{F}$ such that $\Gamma(\mathcal{F},\mathcal{L})$ is isomorphic to the dual Z^* of Z.

Define $w_0 \doteq \mathrm{id}$, $w_1 \doteq s_{\alpha_0}$, $w_{2i} \doteq s_{\beta_0} u_{2i-1} w_{2i-1}$ and $w_{2i+1} \doteq s_{\alpha_0} u_{2i} w_{2i}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$ where $u_1, u_2, \ldots$ are the elements which appear in the above property $\mathsf{Mod3}$. Notice $w_{2i+1}(\tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}) \equiv \tilde\varepsilon_{2i+1} - \tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}$ and $w_{2i+1}(\tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}) \equiv \tilde\varepsilon_{2i+1} - \tilde\omega_{\beta_0}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots$; in particular we can associate to $w_0, w_1, \ldots, w_m$ a ridge Richardson variety $\mathcal{R}$ such that $\mathsf{Hp2}$ is satisfied.

We define $\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_i) \doteq i$ and we extend it by linearity to Ω_A^+; we have $\mathsf{gr}(\alpha_i) = 0$ for $i = 1, \ldots, \ell - 1$ and $\mathsf{gr}(\alpha_\ell) > 0$. In particular $\mathsf{Hp5}$ is satisfied. Notice also that $\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_1) < \cdots < \mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_\ell)$, so $\mathsf{Hp7}$ is satisfied too.

Lemma 10.

i) $\mathsf{Hp6}$ *is satisfied;*

ii) if $V_\lambda \subset \mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}$ *with* $\lambda \in \Omega_A^+$ *and* $\mathsf{gr}(\lambda) \geqslant 2$ *then* $\lambda = \varepsilon_2$*;*

iii) if $V_\lambda \subset \mathfrak{K}_{-a\alpha_0-b\beta_0}$ *with* $\lambda \in \Omega_A^+$ *and* $\mathsf{gr}(\lambda) \geqslant a+b$ *then* $(a,b) \in \{(0,1),(1,0),(1,1)\}$.

Proof. Notice first that by Lemma 9 *ii)*, *iii)* and *iv)* we have a surjective G–equivariant homomorphism from $(V^*_{\varepsilon_1})^{\otimes n}$ to Z^*_n. Hence if V^*_λ appears in Z^*_n as G–submodules then $\mathsf{gr}(\lambda) \leqslant n$.

Notice also that the span of $\mathbb{F}(\varepsilon_n)$ is isomorphic to $V^*_{\varepsilon_n}$, hence in this case we have $\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_n) = n$.

Let now $M \simeq V^*_\lambda$ be a submodule of Z^*_n with $\mathsf{gr}(\lambda) = n$. Consider the Levi subgroup L_K whose simple roots are $\alpha_0, \beta_0, \alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{\ell-1}$ and let U be the L_K–submodule of Z^* generated by the lowest weight vector f_0. This is an irreducible representation of L_K of lowest weight $-\tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}$. Consider also the Levi subgroup L_G of G with simple roots $\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{\ell-1}$.

As above, by Lemma 9 *ii)*, *iii)* and *iv)*, we know that V^*_λ appears with non zero multiplicity in $(V^*_{\varepsilon_1})^{\otimes n}$, hence $\lambda = n\varepsilon_1 - \gamma$ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}[\Delta]$. Furthermore since $\mathsf{gr}(\lambda) = \mathsf{gr}(n\varepsilon_1)$ and $\mathsf{gr}(\alpha_\ell) > 0$ we have $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}[\alpha_1, \ldots, \alpha_{\ell-1}]$. So there exists a vector in Z^*_n of weight $-\mu \in \Lambda_K$ such that $\mu \equiv \tilde\lambda$, moreover $\tilde\omega_{\alpha_0} - \mu = \gamma + a\alpha_0 + b\beta_0$ with $a + b = n$. Since α_ℓ does not appear in $\tilde\omega_{\alpha_0} - \mu$, $-\mu$ is a weight of a non zero vector of the module U and it is non positive against $\alpha_1^\vee, \alpha_2^\vee, \ldots, \alpha_{\ell-1}^\vee$.

Finally notice that the semisimple part of L_K is a group of type $\mathsf{D}_{\ell+1}$ and U is a spin module. This is a minuscule module, so μ must be in the orbit of $\tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}$ for the Weyl group of L_K. Being μ dominant with respect to $\alpha_1^\vee, \alpha_2^\vee, \ldots, \alpha_{\ell-1}^\vee$, a simple computations shows that it must be equivalent to one of the following weights w.r.t. the relation $\equiv$

$$\tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}, \tilde\omega_1 - \tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}, \tilde\omega_2 - \tilde\omega_{\beta_0}, \tilde\omega_3 - \tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}, \tilde\omega_4 - \tilde\omega_{\beta_0}, \ldots$$

The condition $a + b = n$ gives $n \leqslant \ell$ and either $\lambda = 0$ if $n = 0$, or $\lambda = \omega_n$ if $0 < n \leqslant \ell$. Further notice that $\mu = w_n \tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}$, so the module M is the G–module spanned by $\mathbb{F}(\varepsilon_n)$. This proves *i)*.

We now prove *ii)* and *iii)*. Let $V_\lambda \subset \mathfrak{K}_{-a\alpha_0-b\beta_0}$ with $\mathsf{gr}(\lambda) = a + b$. Then there exists a root $\delta \in \Phi_K$ of the form $a\alpha_0 + b\beta_0 + \gamma$ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}[\Delta]$ and $\gamma = -\lambda + (a+b)\varepsilon_1$. From $\mathsf{gr}(\lambda) = a + b$ we see that the root α_ℓ does not appear in γ. In particular δ is a root of a root system of type D (notice however that this system is not numbered in the usual way). We immediately deduce that $a \leqslant 1$ and $b \leqslant 1$. The case $a = 0$ or $b = 0$ is setted by Lemma 9 point *iv)*. We now study the case $a = b = 1$. We notice that the pairing of γ with $\alpha_2^\vee, \ldots, \alpha_\ell^\vee$ must be non positive. From the explicit description of a positive root in a root system of type D we immediately deduce that $\gamma = \alpha_1$ and $\lambda = \varepsilon_2$. □

5.4. **Construction of φ.** The strategy we use is a generalization of the one we adopted in [4]. Let $x_0 \in \mathcal{F}$ be the element fixed by B_K. By Lemma 9 there exists $z_1 \in \mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0}$ and $z_2 \in V_{\varepsilon_2} \subset \mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}$ invariant under H. We define $z = z_1 + z_2$. The idea is to consider the element $\exp(z) \cdot x_0$; since this element is H–invariant the action of G determines an embedding of G/H in $\mathcal{F}$ and φ is defined as the pull–back with respect to this map.

In order to verify all the required hypothesis we need to check some properties. In particular in Kumar construction of the group K in [10], the element $\exp(z)$ does not exists, and we have to go through a technical detour which is completely analogous to the case of symmetric varieties. For this reason we illustrate here the main steps and we refer to [4] Section 5.1 and 5.2 for the details.

As above let Z be the irreducible highest weight module of weight $\tilde{\omega}_0$. Recall that Z is the restricted dual of $Z^* = \Gamma(\mathcal{F}, \mathcal{L})$, and set $Z_{-n} \doteq Z_n^*$. Let v_0 be a highest weight vector of Z and let $J_n \doteq \bigoplus_{m \leqslant n} Z_m$ and f_0 a lowest weight vector in Z^* such that $\langle v_0, f_0 \rangle = 1$. For a subspace $J_m \subset Z$ of finite codimension, the element $x_m \doteq e^z \bar{v}_0 \in Z/J_m$ is well defined and is H–invariant. We can define a map $\imath_m : G/H \longrightarrow \mathbb{P}(Z/J_m)$ by $\imath_m(gH) \doteq g\, x_m$. Since $e^z \cdot \bar{v}_0$ is H–invariant, $\imath_m^*(\mathcal{O}_{\mathbb{P}(Z/J_m)}(1))$ is the trivial bundle on G/H. Hence it defines a map $\imath_m^*$ from the annhilator J_m^0 of J_m in Z^* to $\mathbb{k}[G/H]$. We can normalize this map by requiring that $\imath_m^*(f_0)$ is the constant function 1. We notice that if $m < n \leqslant 0$ then $\imath_m^*\big|_{J_n^0} = \imath_n^*$ and this allows to define a map $\imath^* : Z^* \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}[G/H]$. Finally, as proved in Lemma 43 [4], we see that the symmetric power of $\imath^*$ from $\mathsf{S}(Z^*)$ to $\mathbb{k}[G/H]$ factor through a map $\varphi : \Gamma_{\mathcal{F}} \longrightarrow \mathbb{k}[G/H]$. Hence Hp3 is satisfied.

5.5. **Verification of Hp4.** By the construction of $\mathcal{R}$ and by Hp6, for $i = 1, \dots, \ell$, there exists a unique G–submodule of Z_{-i} isomorphic to V_{ε_i}. We denote this module by M_{-i} and we denote by $q_i : Z_{-i} \longrightarrow M_{-i}$ the projection onto this factor.

Lemma 11. *Let* $a \doteq \sum a_i$ *and* $b \doteq \sum b_i$ *then*

- *i)* $q_n(z_1^{a_1} z_2^{b_1} \cdots z_1^{a_m} z_2^{b_m} \cdot v_0) = q_n(z_1^a z_2^b \cdot v_0)$;
- *ii)* $q_{2i}(z_1^a\, z_2^b \cdot v_0) = 0$ *for* $a \neq 0$ *or* $b \neq i$;
- *iii)* $q_{2i}(z_2^i \cdot v_0) \neq 0$;
- *iv)* $q_{2i+1}(z_1^a\, z_2^b \cdot v_0) = 0$ *for* $a \neq 1$ *or* $b \neq i$;
- *v)* $q_{2i+1}(z_1\, z_2^i \cdot v_0) \neq 0$.

Proof. We decompose Z according to the action of C as we did for the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{K}$: so $Z_{-a\alpha_0 - b\beta_0}$ is the span of the T_K–eigenvectors of weight of the form $\tilde{\omega}_0 - a\alpha_0 - b\beta_0 - \gamma$ with $\gamma \in \mathbb{N}[\Delta]$. We have $Z_{-n} = \bigoplus_{a+b=n} Z_{-a\alpha_0 - b\beta_0}$. Further $M_{-2i} \subset Z_{-i\alpha_0 - i\beta_0}$ and $M_{-2i-i} \subset Z_{-(i+1)\alpha_0 - i\beta_0}$ In particular $q_{2i}(z_1^{a_1} z_2^{b_1} \cdots z_1^{a_m} z_2^{b_m} \cdot v_0) = 0$ if $(a,b) \neq (0,i)$ and $q_{2i+1}(z_1^{a_1} z_2^{b_1} \cdots z_1^{a_m} z_2^{b_m} \cdot v_0) = 0$ if $(a,b) \neq (1,i)$. This implies *ii*) and *iv*).

By the previous remark, *i*) is proved if we show that

$$q_n(z_1^{a_1} z_2^{b_1} \cdots [z_1, z_2] \cdots z_1^{a_m} z_2^{b_m} \cdot v_0) = 0$$

under the assumption $\sum a_i + 2\sum b_i + 3 = n$. If this is not the case we would have a non–zero, hence surjective, G–equivariant map

$$\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0}^{\otimes a_1} \otimes \mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}^{\otimes b_1} \otimes \cdots \mathfrak{K}_{-2\alpha_0-\beta_0} \otimes \cdots \mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}^{\otimes b_m} \longrightarrow M_{-n}$$

given by

$$x_1 \otimes x_2 \cdots \otimes x_r \longmapsto q_n(x_1 \cdot x_2 \cdots v_0).$$

However by Lemma 10 *iii*) and Hp5, V_{ε_n} is not a submodule of $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0}^{\otimes a_1} \otimes \mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}^{\otimes b_1} \otimes \cdots \mathfrak{K}_{-2\alpha_0-\beta_0} \otimes \cdots \mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}^{\otimes b_m}$ and we obtain a contradiction.

We now prove *iii*) and *v*). We order the weights in $\mathbb{N}[\Delta]$ with a complete order $>_\Phi$ in such a way that $\alpha_0 + \beta_0 >_\Phi \alpha_0 >_\Phi \beta_0$. For any non increasing sequence of weights $\eta_1 >_\Phi \eta_2 >_\Phi \cdots >_\Phi \eta_r$ we can consider the G–equivariant map

$$\mathfrak{K}_{-\eta_1} \otimes \mathfrak{K}_{-\eta_2} \otimes \cdots \mathfrak{K}_{-\eta_r} \longrightarrow M_{-n}$$

given by

$$x_1 \otimes x_2 \cdots \otimes x_r \longmapsto q_n(x_1 \cdot x_2 \cdots x_r \cdot v_0).$$

By Hp5, and Lemma 10 *iii*) and by $\langle \beta_0^\vee, \tilde{\omega}_{\alpha_0} \rangle = 0$, this map is zero if $\eta_i \notin \{\alpha_0, \alpha_0 + \beta_0\}$ for some i. Hence, using that Z is generated by v_0, the maps

$$\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}^{\otimes i} \otimes \mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha 0} \longrightarrow M_{-2i-1} \quad \text{and} \quad \mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}^{\otimes i} \longrightarrow M_{-2i}$$

defined as above are surjective. This implies, in turn, that the map

$$K_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}\otimes Z_{-n+2}\longrightarrow M_{-n}\ \text{ given by }\ x\otimes v\mapsto q_n(x\cdot v)$$

is surjective. Denote by N the unique G–submodule of $K_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}$ isomorphic to V_{ε_2} and let $r_n : N\otimes M_{-n+2}\longrightarrow M_{-n}$ be the restriction to $N\otimes M_{-n+2}$ of the last map above. By Hp6, Lemma 10 *iii)* and Hp5, M_{-n} is in the image of r_n. Further by property Mod1 we know that V_{ε_n} appears with multiplicity at most one in $V_{\varepsilon_2}\otimes V_{\varepsilon_{n-2}}$. Hence r_n is the projection onto the isotypic component of type V_{ε_n} of $V_{\varepsilon_2}\otimes V_{\varepsilon_{-n+2}}$ and it is uniquely determined up to a non zero scalar factor.

We now proceed by induction on i. For $i=1$ the statements are clear since $\langle\alpha_0^\vee,\tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}\rangle\neq 0$ and $\langle(\alpha_0+\alpha_1+\beta_0)^\vee,\tilde\omega_{\alpha_0}\rangle\neq 0$. Let n be either $2i$ in case *iii)* or $2i+1$ in case *v)*. If $n>3$ we need to prove that $r_n(h_2\cdot h_{-n+2})\neq 0$ where h_i is a non zero H–invariant vector in V_{ε_i}. Now as already noticed $r_n(h_2\cdot h_{-n+2})\neq 0$ is equivalent to property Mod2. □

We can finaly verify Hp4.

Lemma 12. Hp4 *is satisfied.*

Proof. Let B_n be the span of $\mathbb{F}(\varepsilon_n)$. By what recalled in Section 3.2 $s^{\mathcal{R}}_{\mathcal{F}}$ gives a G–equivariant isomorphism between $\Gamma(\mathcal{R},\mathcal{L})$ and $\bigoplus_{n=1}^{\ell}B_n$, moreover $B_n\simeq V^*_{\varepsilon_n}$ as a G–module. Hence to prove that φ_1 is an isomorphism it is enough to prove that $\imath^*(B_n)\neq 0$. This is equivalent to $q_i(e^z\cdot\bar v_0)\neq 0$ and this follows by the previous Lemma. □

6. Another class of spherical varieties

In this section we apply our method to another class of spherical varieties, listed as (15) in the paper [2] page 656. Let $2\leqslant p\leqslant n-2$, $V\doteq U\oplus U^*\oplus W\oplus\mathbb{C}v$ with U a vector space of dimension p, W a vector space of dimension $2n-2p$. Let B be a symmetric non degenerate bilinear form on V such that $(U\oplus U^*)\oplus W\oplus\mathbb{C}v$ is an orthogonal decomposition of V and B restricted to $U\oplus U^*$ is the natural symmetric bilinear form on this vector space.

For this example $\bar G=\mathsf{SO}(V,B)\simeq\mathsf{SO}(2n+1)$, further $\bar H$ is the subgroup of the elements $g\in\bar G$ such that $g(U)=U$ and $g(v)=v$. For this spherical variety Ω_A^+ is the free monoid generated by the weights $\varepsilon_1=\omega_1$, $\varepsilon_2=\omega_p$ and $\varepsilon_3=\omega_{p+1}$. The $\bar H$–invariant $h_i\in V_{\varepsilon_i}$, $i=1,2,3$, are described as follows: $h_1=v$, h_2 is a non zero vector of $\Lambda^p(U)\subset\Lambda^p(V)$ and $h_3=h_1\wedge h_2$. The following Lemma can be easily checked.

Lemma 13. *For the spherical variety $\bar G/\bar H$ we have:*

Sph1*: $V_{\varepsilon_2}\subset V_{\varepsilon_1}\otimes V_{\omega_{p-1}}$ with multiplicity 1 and $V_{\varepsilon_3}\subset V_{\varepsilon_2}\otimes V_{\varepsilon_1}$ with multiplicity 1;*
Sph2*: $V_{\varepsilon_3}\subset V_{\varepsilon_1}\cdot V_{\varepsilon_2}$ in the coordinate ring of $\bar G/\bar H$;*
Sph3*: $u_1=s_{p-1}s_{p-2}\cdots s_2s_1$, $u_2=s_1s_2\cdots s_{p-1}s_p$ are such that $u_1\varepsilon_1=\varepsilon_2-\omega_{p-1}$, $u_2\varepsilon_2=\varepsilon_3-\varepsilon_1$.*

We now describe K and $\mathcal{R}$. K is the Kac–Moody group whose Dynkin diagram is obtained from the Dynkin diagram of G adding two nodes: a node α_0 connected with α_1 and a node β_0 connected to α_{p-1}. Notice that also in this case K is symmetrizable. With the same notation of the previous section we have we have the following results analogue of Lemma 9:

i) $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0}\simeq V_{\varepsilon_1}$ as a $\mathfrak{g}$–module;
ii) $\mathfrak{K}_{-\beta_0}\simeq V_{\omega_{p-1}}$ as a $\mathfrak{g}$–module;
iii) $\mathfrak{K}_{-\alpha_0-\beta_0}$ as a $\mathfrak{g}$–module and it contains V_{ε_2} with multiplicity one.

Let Q be the standard maximal parabolic subgroup of K relative to the root α_0, $\mathcal{F}\doteq K/Q$. The ridge Richardson variety $\mathcal{R}$ is defined by $w_0\doteq\mathrm{id}$, $w_1\doteq s_{\alpha_0}$, $w_2\doteq s_{\beta_0}u_1w_1$, $w_3\doteq s_{\alpha_0}u_2w_2$. The grade gr if defined by $\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_1)\doteq 1$, $\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_2)\doteq 2$ and $\mathsf{gr}(\varepsilon_3)\doteq 3$.

The construction of φ and the verification of the hypothesis Hp1,Hp2,...,Hp7 is completely similar to the case of model varieties.

We have included here this example since we believe that our theory may be applied to other classes of spherical varieties in a similar way.

REFERENCES

[1] I. N. Bernšteĭn, I. M. Gel′fand, and S. I. Gel′fand. Models of representations of Lie groups. *Trudy Sem. Petrovsk.*, (Vyp. 2):3–21, 1976.

[2] P. Bravi and S. Cupit-Foutou. Classification of strict wonderful varieties. *Ann. Inst. Fourier (Grenoble)*, 60(2):641–681, 2010.

[3] R. Chirivì. LS algebras and application to Schubert varieties. *Transformation Groups*, 5(3):245–264, 2000.

[4] R. Chirivì, P. Littelmann, and A. Maffei. Equations defining symmetric varieties and affine Grassmannians. *Int. Math. Res. Not. IMRN*, (2):291–347, 2009.

[5] C. DeConcini, David Eisenbud, and C. Procesi. Young diagrams and determinantal varieties. *Inventiones mathematicae*, 56:129–165, 1980.

[6] D. Eisenbud. *Commutative algebra*, volume 150 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1995. With a view toward algebraic geometry.

[7] I. M. Gel′fand and A. V. Zelevinskiĭ. Models of representations of classical groups and their hidden symmetries. *Funktsional. Anal. i Prilozhen.*, 18(3):14–31, 1984.

[8] I. M. Gel′fand and A. V. Zelevinsky. Representation models for classical groups and their higher symmetries. *Astérisque*, (Numero Hors Serie):117–128, 1985. The mathematical heritage of Élie Cartan (Lyon, 1984).

[9] W. V. D. Hodge. Some enumerative results in the theory of forms. *Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.*, 39:22–30, 1943.

[10] S. Kumar. *Kac-Moody groups, their flag varieties and representation theory*, volume 204 of *Progress in Mathematics*. Birkhäuser Boston Inc., Boston, MA, 2002.

[11] V. Lakshmibai and P. Littelmann. Richardson varieties and equivariant K-theory. *J. Algebra*, 260(1):230–260, 2003. Special issue celebrating the 80th birthday of Robert Steinberg.

[12] V. Lakshmibai, C. Musili and C.S. Seshadri, Geometry of G/P *Bull. of the A.M.S.* vol. 1, number 2 (1979),

[13] P. Littelmann. Contracting modules and standard monomial theory for symmetrizable Kac-Moody algebras. *J. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 11(3):551–567, 1998.

[14] D. Luna. La variété magnifique modèle. *J. Algebra*, 313(1):292–319, 2007.

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA E FISICA, UNIVERSITÀ DEL SALENTO, VIA PER ARNESANO, 73047 MONTERONI DI LECCE (LE), ITALY
E-mail address: `rocco.chirivi@unisalento.it`

DIPARTIMENTO DI MATEMATICA, UNIVERSITÀ DI PISA, LARGO BRUNO PONTECORVO 5, 56127 PISA (PI), ITALY
E-mail address: `maffei@dm.unipi.it`